

THE DISCIPLINE OF EDUCATION ADMINISTRATION: CREDITING THE PAST

**Rosemary Papa
California State University Sacramento**

In the ways of knowing *Education Administration*, one must acknowledge that knowing where you are requires you to understand where you have been. To assimilate our rich legacy enables each of us to understand our role in preparing leaders in all educational settings. Described by Achilles (2000), "...In studying the practice of administering public schools, the professor is a scholar-practitioner. This professor is a 'bridge, a link, a filter, a roadblock, etc.' on the two-way street between researchers and theoreticians in the disciplines and practitioners" (p. 13). This chapter credits the past by reviewing significant events and works of noted scholars that shaped our professional discipline of educational administration from 1881 to 2005.

Science of School Management 1881-1930

The first course designed to train principals was taught in 1881 by William T. Payne, a former superintendent and later an education professor at the University of Michigan. Almost 100 years ago, in 1904, Cubberley and Strayer became the first professors of education administration in this country (Willower & Culbertson, 1964). Cubberly wrote in 1927, "We have an organized body of knowledge and established principles of action" (p. ix), based on the ideas of William Payne and William Harris who stressed the need for scientific approaches to be used in school administration (Papalewis, 2004).

In 1905, Teacher's College Columbia awarded eight doctorates in educational administration and two of the recipients, Ellwood Cubberly and George Strayer, became professors at Stanford University and Teachers' College, Columbia, respectively (Culbertson, 1988). Later in his career Cubberly (1927) was convinced that educational administration had a knowledge base to solve the problems of managing city school districts when he stated, "...We have had an organized body of knowledge and established principles of action which have been taught generally for some time" (p.8).

In 1920 the number of college courses in school administration had multiplied to supply the demand for administrators for America's schools (Hoyle, 1991). Cubberly believed that from a state perspective more unique interests, "...Called for a more thoroughly sound policy and a firm grasp of economic policy and political theory" (p. 14). The knowledge base at that time consisted of school management, teacher supervision and practical field based experiences, "war stories" for students to emulate from former school administrators (Hoyle, 1991).

The Birth of NCPEA 1940s and 1950s

In 1947 under the guidance of Walter Cocking, editor of *The School Executive* and E. B. Norton, professor of educational administration at Teachers College Columbia, the National Council of Professors of Educational Administration (NCPEA) was founded. These men along with 54 others chartered the first two-week meeting held in August 1947 which was billed as the Work Conference of Professors of Educational Administration (West, Piper, Achilles & Manley, 1988). Seventy-two professors attended. The objectives were to, "... Achieve among conference members a better understanding of the problems of developing leaders in education... [to develop] a common approach regarding the methods and techniques for the more effective preparation of educational administrators" (p. 5).

Many have written of the seminal time between 1946 and 1947 in our field (Achilles, Krieger, Finn & Sharp, 2003; Griffiths, 1988; Hoyle, 1991; Moore, 1964; Papalewis, 2004). These field historians wrote of the administrative theory movement and outlined three primary events that impacted the development of administrative theory. First, 1946 W.K. Kellogg Foundation gave funds to support education administration projects, specifically to advance the study of school administration. Second in 1947, NCPEA was founded (led by Walter Cocking), and third, in 1947 the American Association of School Administrators (AASA) and its Committee for the Advancement of School Administration began standardization for preparation in education administration courses and especially to develop recommendations on strategies for universities to assist in preparing more professional superintendents. These three events, along with Walter Cocking serving as the Editor of *School Executive Magazine* (Achilles, personal communication, August 8, 2003), created the foundation for our profession.

At least three books were spawned at the 1954 historic NCPEA meeting: Campbell and Gregg's *Administrative Behavior in Education* (1957); Coladarci and Getzels' *The Use of Theory in Educational Administration* (1955); and, Griffiths' *Human Relations in School Administration* (1956). At the 1954 meeting the NCPEA committee approved a plan for the Campbell and Gregg book. Also, during the 1960's the *Journal of Education Administration* and *The Educational Administration Quarterly* began.

Next, of special significance at this historic NCPEA meeting in Denver in 1954, was a forum discussion which Halpin (1970) described as follows:

At that meeting the first "real" confrontation between behavioral scientists and professors of education administration took place. Coladarci (of Stanford), Getzels (of Chicago), and Halpin (then of Ohio State University) pointed out to the group—and not gently—that what the CPEA (Cooperative Program in education administration, funded

by the Kellogg Foundation, founded 1950-51) Centers and members of NCPEA were doing in the name of research was distinctly a-theoretical in character and sloppy in quality. The reception that these three behavioral scientists received at that meeting can scarcely be described as cordial. (p. 16)

In 1956 Griffiths concluded that: (1) Better research into education administration was needed; (2) Research must be theory based; and, (3) Since social scientists used some of the same theories, they (social scientists) were to serve as guides for professors of education administration.

The formation of the Cooperative Program in education administration by 1955 had 30 institutions receive grants to advance the study of school administration. Moore (1964) noted that the emphasis on the technical side of schooling (buildings, buses and bonds) began to focus on the teachers and students. NCPEA began the process of sharing practices and strategies for building strong education administration programs focused on effective preparation of school administrators. Ultimately, CPEA is credited with giving birth to the University Council of Educational Administration (UCEA) and the Committee for the Advancement of School Administrators (CASA).

The Giants Theory (1960s)

Willower and Culbertson wrote that emphasis in our field must move in the direction of theory, research and content differentiation (Papalewis, 2004). Campbell (1964) wrote more specifically to the kind of professors sought in education administration, "In seeking talent for the professorship...we should look for men who are bright, who are young, who have dealt with the major ideas of Western culture, who have exhibited some independence and creativity, and who have a commitment to education" (p. 19).

In seeking these ideal professors of education administration, the American Association of School Administration (AASA) in their *1960 Yearbook* listed (Griffiths, 1964) the ideal staffing for our departments. Possibly, this was an early precursor to their role in the standardization of our field: "3 senior faculty members; 5 associate faculty members; 2 assistant faculty members; 10 graduate assistants; and 7 secretaries" (p. 30).

In a seminal book edited by Willower and Culbertson (1964), three theories were offered as policy frameworks for our field to consider: the propinquity/free lunch theory; the great man, or more appropriately today the giant's theory; and, the scientific journal theory. The propinquity theory was based on approximation to how those in our field were housed. Department faculties were advised to be near one another for cross fertilization to occur. The free lunch theory suggested the same. Hughes (1988) who likened administrative expertise as something to be caught like measles, by working closely with more

experienced colleagues. But approximants could also increase individual rancor, hence this theory was seen as lacking (Papalewis, 2004).

The great man theory meant employ “giants” in our field for university and departmental fame. These giants were not to be expected to become team players. The scientific journal theory was meant to harness the intellectual activity of the department. Create a scientific refereed journal and the intellectual activity would increase among the faculty and bring esteem to the department.

In the 1960s, theories relating to practice focused on the administrator as practitioner and was viewed as an outcome of a complex marriage of practice and theory enlivened by the tension between them. “It was believed that practice brought two gifts: The wit to bring theory to its matter...make sense of ideas; and The wit to bridge what theory must become coherent” (Willower & Culbertson, 1964, p. 64). Consequently, “Theory brought three gifts: Depth and breadth of coherent knowledge beyond experience; Breaching walls of personal and social class prejudice; and Expansion and refreshment to experience” (p. 64).

Reller (1962) in the early 1960s argued that field studies in a foreign country were an effective way to provide better understanding of educational changes in the US. Over the next thirty years, this became the purview of the research institutions, often leaving the local community and state education initiatives in the hands of regional comprehensive institutions.

As a field of study, we claim more than a century of knowledge development (See History of Education Administration Timeline Appendix). We anchored our discipline in the medical model of theory and practice. Joseph Schwab (1964) pointedly argued that the theory movement reflected a false model both for inquiry and training. He stated that medicine’s “theory of practice” with the study of biological science and medicine—what diseases and pathologies there are, their symptoms, etiology, causes and treatment is equivalent in education administration. He suggested that the study of the school—the missions it undertakes, and patterns it has used, its strengths and weaknesses, needs and problems is parallel more to the medicine model (Papalewis, 2004).

Theory Movement 1970s+

Since the 1970s, the theory of practice and the practice of theory debate has long been a strong topic for the education administration professorate. Culbertson wrote (1988) that NCPEA helped nurture the new movement by providing forums where scholars could challenge existing research and advocate theory-based norms to professors in attendance from across the nation.

To the study of education administration the theory movement promised to deliver a solid knowledge base (Hoyle, 1991). Today most still believe that our future depends on the theory development. Hoy and Miskel (1991) stated, “The road to generalized knowledge can lie only in tough minded empirical research, not introspection and subjective experience” (p. 25).

In opposition to the theory driven field of study, Greenfield in 1975 stated, “Academicians who assume that social-scientific secrets can explain how organizations work or how policy should be made, indulge at best in premature hope and at worst in a delusion” (Culbertson, 1988, p. 20). Greenfield commented that researchers in education administration wrote of organizations as if they were real. Greenfield espoused that there should be no single paradigms, only theories of education administration that should be limited to specific types of organizations which exist in carefully defined contexts (Papalewis, 2004). Culbertson (1988) wrote that both Greenfield and William Harris stressed that organizations cannot be equated with objective phenomena, “That organizations do not think, choose, or act as theories claim; rather individuals do” (p. 20).

The theory movement has attracted critics who maintain that organizational theory portends that people drive organizations and therefore are too unpredictable to follow hard mathematical and scientific principles (Foster, 1980; Greenfield; 1975; Murphy & Hallinger, 1987; Schwab, 1964). Jack Culbertson (1988) suggested that the theory movement has failed to live up to its billing. Few final answers through theory have been found focused on precise practice applications.

Hughes (1988) described how UCEA moved the field in the direction of comparative approaches. Willower and Forsyth stated (1999), “However much NCPEA and UCEA share & emphasize similar purposes, an underlying exclusivity issue remains” (p. 7). This was evidenced by the comparative world studies versus the local school district action-based research (Papalewis, 2004) that dominated the 1980s and 1990s. Theory development and action based research would begin co-mingling under the umbrella of the effective schools movement.

Paula Silver began her 1983 textbook describing the theory experience:

Discovering what theory is can be an exhilarating experience—like finding a special and exalted plan of existence, a rarefied, crystal-clear atmosphere where everything sparkles with the logic of pure abstraction. To grasp what theory is, beyond any mere definition, is to have a flash of insight about the nature of abstraction, a gasp of recognition that the words represent not mundane tangibles but inventions of the creative mind. (Xiii)

This eloquent definition of the theory experience would soon be elaborated on through inquiry and reflection as it related to practice in the schools.

Ethics and Morals 1980s-1990s

Beginning with the 1980s we began to diversify the field both by faculties and school administrators. This began the movement that would produce more voices into the field and better reflect the growing diversity of our schools. Role modeling and mentoring became the vehicles for moving our field forward. Practice in the schools became more inclusive of women and people of color. Research on gender and race discrimination became a focus to education administration human resource courses with an attempt to be inclusive of 'all voices' to enrich the field of leadership research (Leonard & Papalewis, 1987; Papalewis & Yerkes, 1995; Shakeshaft, 1988).

In 1989 the National Policy Board for Educational Administration was created by UCEA to foster reform in the field and develop policy positions for its Agenda for Reform. This report contained seven recommendations for programs to deliver:

1. Societal and cultural influences in education
2. Teaching and learning processes and school improvement
3. Organizational theory
4. Methodologies of organizational studies and policy analysis
5. Leadership and management processes and functions
6. Policy studies and politics of education
7. Moral and ethical dimensions of schooling

Ethical standards for the profession were emphasized beginning in the 1980's. Papalewis (1988; 1989: August, 1992; Shapiro & Stefkovich, 2001; Wilcox & Ebbs, 1992) wrote that standards of the profession are set by the behavior of those in the profession. Ultimately, one's ability to lead effectively and efficiently is based on the ability to understand and respect individual differences: to be ethical, one must be respectful. Making decisions on assessable data is ethical decision making. As the teachers of leaders, we must provide all available data, from a variety of sources. Research from Gilligan (1982) revealed that in addition to rights and fairness, people have other moral concerns relating to needs of connections, others being taken care of, excluded or hurt (Lyons, 1990). This, Gilligan (1982) called the ethic of caring. Due to different ideologies born out of socialization and acculturation, male experiences indicate that males seek cognitive power and objectivity, justified by an ethic of rights. Female experiences indicate greater use of intuition and subjectivity justified by an ethic of caring (Papalewis, 1989).

Papalewis (1995) wrote that traditional writings in education administration have tended to disregard the existence of different types of leadership leading to a uniform 'typically male' way of perceiving and relating. Moral and ethical leadership allowed diversity and inclusion into education administration. Previous models that were applicable to a single gender were

still the 'realm of the coin' in most education administration textbooks well into the mid-1990's. The need to allow more voices, different voices was beginning to take hold. The professional organizations – NCPEA and UCEA – were no longer single gender nor single race based.

The Knowledge Base 1985-2000+

Throughout the 1980s and mid-1990s the debate of what is our knowledge base raged. Iannaccone (1976) asserted, "The research between 1925 to 1950 is trivial...The bulk of research was done by part-time graduate students in a thesis...Almost all of it is theoretical" (pp. 18-19). Murphy and Hallinger (1987) said, "The knowledge base guiding administrative training is inadequate and inappropriate" (p. 253). Petersen and Finn (1988) wrote, "The issue is not... whether this list or that list is superior. It is rather that no set of competencies, experiences, and knowledge is commonly accepted as the core of any well designed program of graduate study for future school administrations..." (p. 101). The American Association of School Administrators seven major areas of knowledge and skills, Petersen and Finn (1988) felt were commendable. Achilles (2000) wrote,

"If practitioners do not know what improves schools, this reflects upon the EDAD professorate. Consider some points. Research in EDAD is weak (e.g. Achilles, 1990; 1991; Boyan, 1981; Erickson, 1979; Haller, 1979; Haller & Knapp, 1985); few EDAD professors do research or list it as a major strength (e.g., McCarthy & Kuh, 1997; McCarthy, Kuh, Newell & Iacona, 1988), so the EDAD knowledge base is suspect." (p. 11)

Culbertson (1988) felt that educational journals should be challenged to, "...Devote more space and energy to constructive, and at times critical service in the direction of educational leadership of a new type" (p. 4). He claimed that Strayer and Cubberly were, "...More interested in clarifying educational policies than in discovering laws or defining the deeper meaning of educational science" (p. 11).

In describing his experiences in serving as the editor of the American Educational Research Association Journal (*Educational Researcher*) Donmoyer (1999) lamented the lack of healthy debate that is rich in depth (Papalewis, 2004). He stated,

...[When we] engage in discussion and debate, it will be hard for them not to re-enact the sort of adversarial scripts employed in the past, despite the fact that such scripts did little to promote understanding of a rival's position and functioned primarily to reassure each debater and

his (or, in a few instances, her) supporters of the correctness of their a priori point of view...I am in the last year of a three-year term as the editor of the American Educational Research Association journal,

Educational Researcher. I had hoped to use my tenure as editor to encourage the sort of cross-perspective interaction I am talking about here but found this difficult to do. Responses arrived long after articles appeared; policies required they be sent out for review; reviewers did not always respond in a timely fashion; rejoinders also required review. The whole process was elongated, exceedingly formal and more than a little artificial. (39-40)

What has been written about education administration in edited collections of writings (see Table 1) was the juxtaposition of scientific knowledge development characterized best by Griffiths versus Greenfield (Papalewis, 2004). Greenfield declared that the heretofore sacred tenets for quantitative research were the noose around our neck. Today, he is the poster child for leadership from an organizational theorist perspective: the power of the individual within the organization defies social science research. Fenwick English (2002) has captured this challenge of social science research by calling it regressive and unable to predict the “Known, let alone the unanticipated” (p. 2). The second education administration collection of writings was characterized best by Donmoyer’s utilitarian approach, the Big Tent. He wrote that, “When we recommend contradictory things, we almost guarantee that research will be used selectively as a political weapon instead of as a tool to help resolve educational disputes intellectually rather than through the use of brute power” (p. 35).

Table 1 *Seminal Edited Books in Education Administration*

1957 - *Administrative Behavior in Education: A Project of the National Council of Professors of Educational Administration*. Edited by R.F. Campbell and R.T. Gregg.

1988 - *Handbook of Research on Educational Administration*. Edited by N. Boyan. New York: Longman.

1999 - *Handbook of Research on Educational Administration Second Edition: A Project of the American Research Association*. Edited by J. Murphy and K. Seashore Lewis.

Much criticism has been written about the lack of a rigorous basis for education administration: that we fail to deliver on what the practitioner calls ‘walking the talk.’ The field abounds with pundits who have spent their

professional career deciding that we fail most in not preparing leaders for our nation's schools (Achilles, 1994; Brown & Irby, 2001; English, 1998; Finn, 2003; Greenfield, 1984; Griffiths, 1988; Hoyle, English & Steffy, 1985; McCarthy, 1999; Murphy, 2000b; No Child Left Behind, 2001; Peterson & Finn, 1988; RAND, 2003; Sergiovianni, 1992; Shakeshaft, 1988).

Cynics contend that the history of education administration is new and gangly in comparison to other professions, such as, medicine and law. These professions have state and national boards that influence program standards, content, instructional processes and licensing (McCarthy, 1999).

Alternative Deliveries 1960s+

What is the effect on education administration from alternative deliveries? Papalewis (2000) wrote of the for-profits like the University of Phoenix or public for-profits such as the University of London's Open University that have catered to non-traditional students that were not so well served by the conventional university setting. At these alternative schools, nontraditional students found classes at night, and an academic calendar that made sense for people working full-time. The Open University, London University, founded in the 1960's, used radio and television to deliver distributed learning courses. The NOVA program began to offer school leaders a field based doctorate in the early 1970s. In 1989 the University of Phoenix awarded its first online degree.

Today, the advent of asynchronous learning disconnects education administration from its traditional geography. Students are no longer bound by dislocation to distant schools nor full-time, highly inflexible programs. Learning, such a vital component today in the life of the individual, can now occur virtually anytime and anyplace. That flexibility is the hallmark of a new age in education. Asynchronous learning is not just a viable new means of learning, but in fact, a paradigm shift that will wholly revise our notion of education. In fact, the first argument often heard at universities when confronted with change, and particularly technological change, is that of the threat to quality. Private businesses like the University of Phoenix have hastened the emergence of that reality. Perhaps the most unique element of this era of turmoil for the educational empire is the sheer scope of the change that is occurring (Papalewis, 2000a; 2000b; 2002).

Conclusion

West, Piper, Achilles and Manley (1988) in the *4th Decade of NCPEA: 1977-1986* wrote a short history of the genesis of NCPEA. Briefly, it was described as:

NCPEA's *first decade [1947-1957]*...was a period of actual survival and growth...NCPEA professors moved their attention from merely techniques and practices to a theory of administration....The *second decade [1957-1967]* emphasized...assessment of NCPEA's direction; the behavioral sciences and administration theory; development of recurring cycles of program emphasis; institutionalization of some aspects of the conference...and a publication...The *third decade [1967-1977]* was marked by an increased number of minority professors broadly defined to mean 'both men and women' participated coupled with a high priority on family events...The *fourth decade [1977-1987]*...was like Charles Dickens's *Tale of Two Cities* offered the best of times and the worst of times...it was a time of reform...a time of retrenchment...it was a plea for practice and a retreat to theory...there was inspiration together with disenchantment, eagerness tempered by reluctance, and boldness giving way to timidity. (pp. 9-12, 14-15)

Perhaps and for the purpose of constructive debate, we can best describe the last 114 year history, as a field that 'regresses to the mean' when change comes upon us. The early 20th century was focused on the science of school management. The mid 20th century was characterized by administration as a science. The business model of management gave way to the medical model of theory building. The later part of the 20th century embraces cultural pluralism while moving to narrow the education administration curriculum to a very prescribed path.

President Levine (2005) of Teacher's College Colombia, which in 1905 issued the first eight doctorates in education administration, has recently called for the dismantling of most Ed.D. programs in education administration. In 1954, a similar criticism of sloppy and a-theoretical programs was raised. The in-fighting and finger-pointing characterized at the 1954 Denver NCPEA conference makes one a believer that history does repeat itself.

References

- Achilles, C.M. (1990, Summer). Research in education administration: One position. *The AASA Professor*, 13 (1), 1-3.
- Achilles, C.M. (1991, Spring). Reforming educational administration: An agenda for the 1990s. *Planning and Changing*, 22 (1), 23-33.
- Achilles, C.M. (1994). Searching for the golden fleece: The epic struggle continues. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 30 (1), 6-16.
- Achilles, C.M. (2000). *Drama in education administration (edad): A morality play or a farce?* A presentation at the National Council of Professors of Educational Administration, Ypsilanti, MI.
- Achilles, C.M., Krieger, J.D., Finn, J.D. & Sharp, M. (February, 2003). *School improvement should rely on reliable, scientific evidence. Why did "No Child Left Behind" leave class size behind?* A symposium presented at the Conference-Within-A-Convention American Association of School Administrators, New Orleans, LA...
- Achilles, C.M. (Personal communication, August 8, 2003).
- Boyan, N. (1981). Follow the leader: Commentary on research in educational administration. *Educational Researcher*, 10 (2), 6-13, 21.
- Boyan, N. (Ed.). (1988). *Handbook of research on educational administration: A project of the American educational research association*. New York: Longman.
- Brown G. & Irby, B. (2001). Preparing female superintendents: Curriculum considerations. In P. Jenlink (Ed.), *Marching into a new millennium: The Seventh Yearbook of the National Council of Professors of Educational Administration*, pp. 212-228. Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Education Book.
- Campbell, R.F. (1964). The professorship in educational administration: Preparation. In D. J. Willower and J. A. Culbertson (Eds.), *The professorship in educational administration*. Columbus, Ohio: University Council for Educational Administration (pp. 15-28).
- Campbell, R.F. & Gregg, R.T. (Eds.). (1957). *Administrative Behavior in Education*. Sponsored by NCPEA. New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers.
- Coladarci, A.P. & Getzels, J.W. (1955). *The use of theory in educational administration*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Cubberly, E.P. (1927). *State school administration*. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin.
- Culbertson, J.A. (1988). A century's quest for a knowledge base, chapter 1. In N. J. Boyan (Ed.), *Handbook of research on educational administration*, (pp. 3-26). New York, N.Y.: Longman, INC.

- Donmoyer, R. (1999). The continuing quest for a knowledge base: 1976-1998. In J. Murphy, K. S. Louis (Eds.), *Handbook of research on educational administration, 2nd Edition*. (pp. 25-43). New York: Longman.
- English, F. (1998). The cupboard is bare: The postmodern critique of educational administration. *Journal of Educational Leadership*, 4-26.
- English, F. (2002, September 30). *Memorandum about the policing functions of ELCC/NCATE and the standardization of university preparation programs in educational administration*. Retrieved July 2, 2003 from <http://www.ncpea.net>
- Erickson, D.A. (1979). Research on educational administration: The state-of-the-art. *Educational Researcher*, 8 (3), 9-14,
- Finn, C. (2003, May). *The fordham foundation better leaders for America's schools: A manifesto*. Retrieved July 2, 2003 from <http://www.ncpea.net/>
- Foster, W.P. (1980). Administration and the crisis in legitimacy: A review of Habermasian thought. *Harvard Educational Review*.
- Gilligan, C. (1982). *In a different voice*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Greenfield, T.B. (1975). Theory about organization: A new perspective and its implications for schools. In M. G. Hughes (Ed.), *Administering education: International challenge* (pp. 71-99). London: Athlone.
- Greenfield, T.B. (1984). Theories of educational organization: A critical perspective. *International Encyclopedia of Education: Research and Studies*. Oxford: Pergamon.
- Griffiths, D. (1956). *Human relations in school administration*. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.
- Griffiths, D.E. (1964). The professorship in educational administration: Environment. In D. J. Willower and J. A. Culbertson (Eds.), *The professorship in educational administration*. Columbus, Ohio: University Council for Educational Administration (pp. 29-46).
- Griffiths, D.E. (1988). Administrative theory, chapter 2. In N. J. Boyan (Ed.), *Handbook of research on educational administration*. New York, N.Y.: Longman, INC.
- Haller, E.J. (1979). Questionnaires and the dissertation in educational administration. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 21 (3), 151-168.
- Haller, E.J. & Knapp, T.R. (1985, Summer). Problems and methodology in educational administration. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 21 (3), 157-168.
- Halpin, A.W. (1970). The fumbled torch. In A. Kroll (Ed.), *Issues in American Education*. New York: Oxford.

- Hoy, W. & Miskel, C. (1991). *Educational administration* (4th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Hoyle, J.R. (1991, Fall/Winter). Point-counterpoint: Educational administration has a knowledge base. *Record*, 21-27.
- Hoyle, J.R., English, F. & Steffy, B. (1985). *Skills for successful school leaders*. Arlington, VA: The American Association of School Administrators.
- Hughes, M.G. (1988). Comparative educational administration, chapter 30. In N. J. Boyan (Ed.), *Handbook of research on educational administration*. New York, N.Y.: Longman, INC.
- Iannaccone, L. (1976, May). *50 years of deed, program and research in educational administration*. Tel Aviv: University of Tel Aviv. Conference paper.
- Leonard, P. Y. & Papalewis, R. (1987). The underrepresentation of women and minorities in education administration: Patterns, issues, and recommendations. *Journal of Educational Equity and Leadership*, 7 (3), 188-207.
- Lyons, N. (1990). Visions and competencies: Ethical and intellectual dimensions of decision-making and conflict negotiation. In J. Antler and S. Biklen (Eds.) *Changing Education: Women as Radicals and Conservators*. Albany, N.Y.: SUNY Press.
- McCarthy, M., Kuh, G.D., Newell, L.J. & Iacona, C.M. (1988). *Under scrutiny: The educational administration professoriate*. A presentation at the national conference of the University Council of Educational Administration, Tempe, AZ.
- McCarthy, M. & Kuh, G.D. (1997). *Continuity and change: The educational leadership professoriate*. A presentation at the national conference of the University Council of Educational Administration, Columbia, MO.
- McCarthy, M. (1999). Evolution of educational leadership preparation programs. In J. Murphy & K. S. Louis (Eds.), *Handbook on research in educational administration* (pp.119-140). New York: Longman.
- Moore, H.A. (1964). The ferment in school administration. In D. Griffiths (Ed.), *Behavioral science in educational administration*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Murphy, J. & Hallinger, P. (Eds.). (1987). *Approaches to administrative training in education*, (Chapter 15). New York: State University of New York Press.
- Murphy, J. (2000). A quest for a center: Notes on the state of the profession of educational administration. In P. Jenlink (Ed.), *Marching into a new millennium: The seventh yearbook of the national conference of professors of educational administration* (16-81). Lanham, MA: The Scarecrow Press.

- Murphy, J. & Seashore-Louis, K. (Eds.). (1999). *Handbook of research on educational administration, second edition: A project of the American educational research association*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, Inc., Publishers.
- No Child Left Behind (NCLB). (2001). *Conference report to accompany H.R.Rep. No. 107-334*, 107th Cong., 1st session.
- Papalewis, R. (1988). A case study in organizational culture: Administrator's shared values, perceptions, and beliefs. *Planning & Changing*, 19 (3), 158-165.
- Papalewis, R. (1989). Ethics through the eyes of gender. *The Journal of CAPEA*, 1 (1), 1-2.
- Papalewis, R. (August, 1992). Ethical standards for our profession. In W. Beckner & J. K. March (Eds.) *Change as Tradition: Challenges of Leadership for Professors of Educational Administration*, Selected Papers from the 45th Annual Conference of the National Council of Professors of Educational Administration. Kent, Ohio: The Center for School Personnel Relations.
- Papalewis, R. (1995). Fe/male voices: Leadership and the knowledge base. In R. Donmoyer, J. Scheurich & M. Imber (Eds.), *The Knowledge Base in Educational Administration: Multiple Perspectives*. Albany, New York: State University of New York Press.
- Papalewis, R. & Yerkes, D. (1995). Fe/male leadership: The role of communication. In B. Irby & G. Brown (eds.), *Women as school executives: Voices and vision*. Huntsville, Texas: Sam Houston Press.
- Papalewis, R. (Winter, 2000). Asynchronous Partners. *Journal of the Intermountain Center for Education Effectiveness*, 1 (1), 33-39.
- Papalewis, R. (August, 2000). Asynchronous Partners: Leadership for the millennium. *The seventh yearbook of the National Council of Professors of Educational Administration*. Lancaster: Technomic Publishing Co., Inc.
- Papalewis, R. (Fall, 2002). Revisiting the 1999 Walter Cocking Lecture: Asynchronous partners. *Education Leadership Review*, 3 (3).
- Papalewis, R. (2004). Practice of theory to theory of practice: The prime directive. *The Eighth Yearbook of the National Council of Professors of Educational Administration*. Lancaster: Economic Publishing Co., Inc.
- Peterson, D. & Finn, C. (1988). Principals, superintendents and the administrator's art. In D. Griffiths, R. Spout & P. Forsyth (Eds.), *Leaders for America's schools*.
- RAND, Gates, S.M., Ringel, J.E., Santibanez L., Ross, K.E. & Chung, C.H. (2003). *Who is leading our schools? An overview of school administrators and their careers*. Santa Monica, CA: RAND Education.

- Reller, T. (1962). A comprehensive program for the preparation of administrators. In J. Culbertson & S. Heneley (Eds.), *Preparing administrators: New perspectives*. Columbus, OH: UCEA.
- Schwab, J.J. (1964). The professorship in educational administration: Theory—art--practice. In D. J. Willower and J. A. Culbertson (Eds.), *The professorship in educational administration*. Columbus, Ohio: University Council for Educational Administration (pp. 48-70).
- Sergiovanni, T.J. (1992). *Moral leadership: Getting to the heart of school improvement*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Shakeshaft, C. (1988). Women in educational administration: Implications for training. In D. Griffiths, R. Stout, P. Forsyth (Eds.), *Leaders for America's Schools*. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan Publishers.
- Shapiro, J.P. & Stefkovich, J.A. (2001). *Ethical leadership and decision making in education: Applying theoretical perspectives to complex dilemmas*. Mahwah, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.
- Silver, P.F. (1983). *Educational administration, theoretical perspectives on practice and research*. Cambridge, MA: Harper & Row, Publishers, New York.
- West, P.T., Piper, D., Achilles, C.M. & Manley, C.A. (1988). *The 4th decade of NCPEA: 1977-1986*. National Council of Professors of Educational Administration: University of North Dakota Press.
- Wilcox, J.R. & Ebbs, S.L. (1992). The leadership compass: Values and ethics in higher education. *Ashe-ERIC Higher Education Report No. 1*. Washington, D.C.: The George Washington University, School of Education and Human Development.
- Willower, D.J., & Culbertson, J. (1964). Preface. In D. J. Willower and J. A. Culbertson (Eds.), *The professorship in educational administration*. Columbus, Ohio: University Council for Educational Administration (v-viii).
- Willower, D.J., & Forsyth, P.B. (1999). A brief history of scholarship on educational administration. In J. Murphy and K. S. Louis (Eds.), *Educational Administration, 2nd Edition*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Appendix
History of Education Administration Timeline

469 B.C.	Socrates
427 B.C.	Plato
384 B.C.	Aristotle
1881 – 1882	The first course designed to train principals and superintendents is created and taught by William T. Payne, a former superintendent and professor of education, University of Michigan
1875 -- 1900	A Science of Education and Management curriculum designed by Practitioners (Professors Payne and Harris)
1900s	Elements of business management and education included in preparation
1901 -- 1925	Science of School Management (Professors Cubberley and Strayer)
1905	First eight doctorates in Education Administration awarded by Teachers' College, Colombia. Two recipients are Ellwood Cubberly and George Strayer
1920s	Ellwood Cubberley began first training program (Stanford) in Education Administration, Instructional Leadership
1926 -- 1950	Education and Management Science widens and deepens (Professors Dewey, Sears, Mort, Moehlman, Sargeant)
1947	NCPEA founded with the mission to improve educational leadership Led by Professor Walter Cocking
1951 -- 1966	Leap toward Administrative Science (Professors Getzel, Griffiths, Halpin, Coleman, and Schwab) (Professor Griffith's foci human relations and administrative theory)

- 1954 NCATE National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education, founded. Today, 33 national educational associations form the council.
- 1957 UCEA founded with the mission to improve professional preparation of educational administrators through a consortium of universities in the United States and Canada
- 1960s The Open University, London University, was founded to prepare people for external degrees using radio and television
- 1970 --1980s Effective schools + instructional Leadership
Technology mediated instruction becomes available for most universities
- 1972 NOVA, first field based doctoral Ed.D. program in education
- 1983 *A Nation At Risk* is published by the National Commission on Excellence in Education to stem the spread of federal dollars into education at all levels
- 1987 *Leaders for America's Schools*, report by NCEE recommended closing 300-500 programs not meeting standards of program quality
- 1987 National Policy Board for Educational Administration (NPBEA) is founded by UCEA for unified policy influence for education administration and in reaction to *A Nation At Risk*.
- 1988 *Handbook on Research on Educational Administration*, N. Boyan Editor
- 1989 *Improving the Preparation of School Administrators: An Agenda for Reform*, report from NPBEA recommended eliminating inadequate professional preparation programs
- 1989 University of Phoenix awards its first online degree (University of Phoenix was founded in 1976)
- 1991 -- 1992 First female president elected by NCPEA

- 1990s Internet and asynchronous learning begins widespread distribution of alternative programs
- 1993 + The NCPEA Yearbooks for scholarly contributions to the discipline
- 1996 National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) adopted curriculum guidelines developed by NPBEA (1994) for accrediting education administration programs
- 1997 ISLLC Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium
Founded by the Council of Chief State School Officers to develop model standards and assessments for school leaders. Today, its policies are adopted in 35 states. The NPBEA adopted ISLLC as, “The EDAD contribution to the ‘standards’ movement” (Achilles, 2000).
- 1999 *Handbook on the Study of Educational Administration*, J. Murphy and K.S. Louis
- 2001 National Commission for the Advancement of Educational Leadership Preparation (NCAELP), established to improve the quality of educational leadership in the United States
- 2002 No Child Left Behind Act, federal legislation is enacted as an unfunded mandate not supporting public education
- 2002 School Leaders License Assessment (SLLA) developed by Educational Testing Service and ISLLC. *The ETS School Leadership Series* is a set of performance-based assessments for the licensure and professional development of school superintendents, principals, and other school leaders.
- 2005 *Educating School Leaders* Report by Arthur Levine, Teachers College Columbia. A scathing report on the preparation of superintendents and principals

*Adapted from Papalewis, 2003